



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/680,991 | 10/06/2000 | John Murata | 1001580-712 | 1957 |
| 21839 7590 12/10/2008 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| TRUONG, LECHI | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2194 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 12/10/2008 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,991

Applicant(s)

MURATA, JOHN

Examiner

LECHI TRUONG

Art Unit

2194

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/06/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 10, 11, 14, 17-20 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 10, 11, 14, 17-20 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/26/2002

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 4-7, **10-11, 14, 17-20, 22-25** are presented for the examination. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 12, 13, 15-16, 21, 26 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 11, 18, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:

The content – claims 1, 11, 18, and 23;

- b. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. As to claim 23, it is uncertain what the relationship between the snapshot and the response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 4-7, 10, 22, 23-25 directed to the method claims that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a 101 statutory process, the claim should be positively reciting the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps. Appropriate correction is required to add the computer performs the steps of the methods.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to because the claims 11, 14, 17 mention computer readable medium. However, the specification does not mention this medium is storage medium. The specification should be so revised.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **4-6, 22-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al (6, 629127 B1) in view of Klein (US 6061678 A) and further in view of McChesney et al (US. 5, 857102).

As to claim 4, Deen teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: the client (the client 18, col 4, and ln 35-40), an HTTP path name having and identify (the URL “

http://server/document [container]. Html, col 4, ln 39-45/ identify of a container within the server (the URL contained in the request to a physical path (for example, the URL "http://server/document.htm" that might be contained in a request can get mapped to "D:\backslash.inetpub.backslash.wwwroot.backslash.document.htm namespace"http"/www.document.com, col 4, ln 40-45/ col 11, ln 55-63), generating at the client an HTTP path name having identity of a container within the server (col 4, ln 35-45/ col 11, ln 45-55), data (resource, col 11, ln 45-51/ ln 55-59), a container within the server that contains data (col 11, ln 45-51/ ln 55-59), transmitting the HTTP path name from the client to the server (col 11, ln 55-59/ col 4, ln 35-40), determining at the server whether the HTTP path name includes the identity of the container of the server(col 4, ln 40-45/ col 11, ln 50-55/ col 12, ln 55-60), processing the HTTP path name to retrieve the data from the server if the HTTP path name includes the identify of the container(col 11, ln 55-59), transmitting the data the client(col 12, ln 8-14), the data corresponding to the HTTP path name(col 11, ln 55-59).

Deen does not teach server retrieve the data, transferring the data from the server, retrieve a snapshot of the server, the snapshot representing the content of the identified container at a particular point in time, generating at the server, from the snapshot, a response including the administrative data. However, Klein teaches retrieve a snapshot of the server, the snapshot representing the content of the identified container at a particular point in time, generating at the server, from the snapshot, a response including the administrative data(the server sends to the client data from a particular " snapshot" of the database. A snapshot is like a timestamp. A snapshot of the database reflects all changes committed to the database as of a particular point in time, and no changes committed after that point in time, col 7, ln 57-67/ and a server (a "database

server"). When a client requires data, the client submits a query to the server that selects the data. The server retrieves the selected data from a database and returns copies of the selected data to the client, col 1, ln 29-35/the server then sets the snapshot-id time in the locator to time T2 and passes the locator back to the client, col 8, ln 27-31/ When the client requests operations on the LOB, the client passes back the locator with the requests. The server reads the server reads the snapshot-id value from the locator and determines which version of the requested LOB data to supply to the client. The server then supplies the appropriate version of the specified portion of the LOB to the client. The server may supply to the client an out-of-date version of a portion of a LOB, for example, if the requested portion of the LOB has been updated by another client subsequent to the snapshot time indicated in the locator that accompanies the request. By supplying to a client LOB data as it existed as of the time represented in a locator's snapshot-id, the client is, in effect, allowed to operate on a separate copy of the LOB that was made at the snapshot time, even though no such copy was actually made, col 7, ln 65-67, col 8, ln 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Deen with Klein to incorporate the feature of server retriever the data, transferring the data from the server, retrieve a snapshot of the server, the snapshot representing the content of the identified container at a particular point in time, generating at the server, from the snapshot, a response including the administrative data because this provide a mechanism to efficiently access LOBs and desired portions within LOBs.

Deen and Klein do not explicitly teach the data as the administrative data about server. However, McChesney teaches the administrative data about server (Each server administrator

203 maintains configuration information for the particular server 201 associated with the server administrator 203, including information that can be known whether or not the server 201 is executing (col 6, ln 22-25/ The server administrator 203 provides clients 105 with a unified means for accessing and manipulating configuration information about the server 201 with which it is associated. FIG. 4a illustrates a dataflow diagram of the basic architecture of obtaining and manipulating configuration information. Generally, the server administrator 203 receives 401 a request from a client 105, through an invocation of one of its operations or attributes, for selected configuration information about the server 201. The server administrator 203 will execute 403(a,b) the appropriate method, as requested by the client 105 to manipulate the information. The server administrator 203 may then return 413 the information to the client 105 if requested (col 8, ln 1-14).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Deen and Klein with McChesney to incorporate the feature of the administrative data about server because this allows the client to obtain and manipulate the startup configuration for many different servers by accessing their respective server administrators.

As to claim 5, Deen teaches server determines whether the HTTP path name includes the identity of the container (col 4, ln 40-45/ col 11, ln 50-55/ col 12, ln 55-60).

As to claim 6, Deen teaches the server process the HTTP path name to retrieve the data (col 4, ln 40-49).

As to claim 22, Deen teaches path name indicates a virtual hierarchical data structure of container (col 12, ln 5-15).

As to claims 23-25, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 7, 22, therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 7, 22 above.

6. Claims **7, 11, 14, 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al (6,629,127 B1) in view of Klein(US 6061678 A) in view of McChesney et al (US. 5,857,102), as applied to claim 4, and further in view of Dillingham (US. Patent 6,327,608 B1).

As to claim 7, Deen, Klein and McChesney do not teach the server transmits an HTTP page if a container is not identified. However, Dillingham teaches the server transmits an HTML page if a container is not identified within the HTTP path name (col 7, ln 61-63).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Deen, Klein and McChesney with Dillingham to incorporate the feature of the server transmits an HTTP page if a container is not identified because this allows access to a Web site's files and configuration parameters with high security and authentication procedures.

As to claims 11, 14, 18, they are apparatus claims of claims 4-7; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-7 above.

7. Claim **10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al (6,629,127 B1) in view of Klein(US 6061678 A) in view of McChesney et al (US. 5,857,102), as applied to claim 4 above, in view of Harrison et al (US. 6,622,170 B1).

As to claim 10, Deen, Klein and McChesney not teach changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name. However, Harrison teaches changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name (configuration application 15 also sets the path of information to allow updates the policies, col 6, ln 44-46).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Deen, Klein and McChesney with Harrison to incorporate the feature of changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name because this allows the information in the LDAP server is altered to match with the implementation of the LDAP server.

8. Claims **17, 19, 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al (6, 629,127 B1) in view of Klein (US 6061678 A) in view of McChesney et al (US. 5, 857,102), Dillingham (US. Patent 6, 327,608 B1), as applied to claim 11 above, in view of Harrison et al (US. 6, 622,170 B1).

As to claim 17, Deen, Klein, McChesney and Dillingham not teach changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name. However, Harrison teaches changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name (configuration application 15 also sets the path of information to allow updates the policies, col 6, ln 44-46).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Deen, Klein, McChesney and Dillingham with Harrison to incorporate the feature of changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name because this

allows the information in the LDAP server is altered to match with the implementation of the LDAP server.

As to claim 19, Harrison teaches changing a value of the server with the HTTP path name (configuration application 15 also sets the path of information to allow updates the policies, col 6, and ln 44-46).

As to claim 20, it is an apparatus claim of claim 17; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 17 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

/LeChi Truong/

Application/Control Number: 09/680,991

Page 10

Art Unit: 2194

Examiner, Art Unit 2194

LeChi Truong

December 10, 2008